Cotimus Black, 1961; Genotype *C. alicae* Black, 1961 from the Miocene of Montana, U.S.A. To this genus belong *C. medius*, *C. helveticus*, etc.

Democricetodon Fahlbusch, 1964, with the subgenera *Democricetodon* and *Megacricetodon* Fahlbusch, 1964. Freudenthal, 1965 considered these subgenera as separate genera; Fahlbusch, 1966 agreed with this conception.

Fahlbusch, 1964 rejected Schaub's interpretation of the name *C. minus* and gave a new one; this interpretation is based on the small Sansan collection in the Paris Museum of Natural History, which was presumably collected by Lartet, and which also contains his lectotypes of *C. sansaniensis* and *C. medius*. A fragment of a maxilla and a fragment of a mandible from this collection evidently belong to the species which Schaub, 1925 identified as *C. breve*. Fahlbusch chose these two specimens as the lectotype and paralectotype respectively, of *Democricetodon* (*Democricetodon*) *minor* (Lartet, 1851). The species which Schaub, 1925 considered as *C. minus* Lartet, 1851 was consequently given a new name; *Democricetodon* (*Megacricetodon*) *schaubi* Fahlbusch, 1964. Freudenthal, 1965 did not agree with this interpretation and proposed maintaining the original interpretation by Schaub.

6. In the following account Fahlbusch and Freudenthal each give their view concerning this problem. We request the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, to decide what should be regarded as *Cricetodon minus* Lartet, 1851.

PROPOSAL OFFICIALLY TO RECOGNIZE SCHAUB'S INTERPRETATION OF THE NAME *CRICETODON* MINUS LARTET, 1851

By M. Freudenthal

Arguments:

(a) Lartet described *C. minus* as " plus petit que notre souris domestique ". Apparently this designation was based on the lengths of either isolated molars or of the tooth rows in complete jaws. In both cases Schaub's interpretation fits better than Fahlbusch's interpretation: *C. minor* sensu Schaub is definitely smaller than *C. minor* sensu Fahlbusch. The field of variation of the lengths of the tooth rows in *Mus musculus* L. (most probably the " souris domestique " mentioned by Lartet) partly overlaps the field of variation in *C. minor* sensu Schaub; the average for *Mus musculus* is smaller, but at least the diagnosis of Lartet is valid for a number of specimens of *C. minor* sensu Schaub. However, all specimens of *C. minor* sensu Fahlbusch are larger than *M. musculus*; thus, Fahlbusch's interpretation is not consistent with the original diagnosis.

(b) The original material of Lartet, used by Fahlbusch, is of doubtful value. Even if it was actually collected by Lartet, there is no certainty at all that it constitutes the type collection on which the original diagnoses were based; for this reason one may choose neotypes from it, but no lectotypes. Furthermore, even if it were the type collection, it is certainly not the complete type collection; *C. minor* sensu Schaub is not present in it, though it is the most abundant species from Sansan. Gervais, 1859 figures some of Lartet's material from Sansan. Though the figures are rather bad, there is no doubt that table 44, fig. 22 and 25a, represent *C. minor* sensu Schaub. This proves that Lartet actually had some material of this species; the fact that it is lacking in the remaining collection in the Paris Museum cannot be a reason for rejecting Schaub's interpretation.

The " Lartet's original material " makes it probable that Lartet had both the small *Megacricetodon* species and the small *Democricetodon* species, and that he took them together under the name *C. minus*. Schaub, 1925 recognized that there actually were two species, and chose one of these to be called *C. minus*. Schaub should be considered as the first reviser, and his interpretation has priority. Unfortunately Schaub did not designate a neotype.

(c) The Sansan collection in the Paris Museum is accompanied by a list of determinations; this list was certainly not made by Lartet. For example, a molar of *C. sansaniensis* is listed as *C. medium*; *C. sansaniensis*, however, is so easily recognizable, that one can hardly believe that this mistake could have been made by Lartet. For this reason it seems not advisable to give too much value to the other determinations on the same list, in particular to the determination of *C. minus*.

(d) After much confusion on the meaning of the names *medium* and *minus* (which were always interpreted in different ways by succeeding authors (Schlosser, 1884; Filhol, 1891; Deperet, 1892; Forsyth Major, 1899, etc.)) Schaub was the first author to give a clear and unambiguous interpretation of *C. minor*. Schaub rejected the name *C. medium*. Fahlbusch chose a new meaning for the name *medius*, and there cannot be too many objections to this, because he simply replaces one name by another one; this will not cause any confusion. However, in the case of *C. minor*, Fahlbusch changes the meaning of this name as it had been generally accepted since 1925, and introduces a new name for the species that had been called *C. minor* for more than 40 years. This procedure is most confusing and prejudicial to the stability of nomenclature.

Proposed solution:

(e) Schaub's interpretation of the name *C. minus* should be maintained. Thus, this species should be called *Megacricetodon minor* (Lartet, 1851). The neotype of this species is No. Ss 1235, Naturhist. Museum Basel. This specimen, which is also the holotype of *M. schaubi* Fahlbusch, 1964, is figured in Fahlbusch, 1964, page 65, fig. 48. *M. schaubi* and *M. minor* thus have the same type specimen, and are per definition objectively synonymous. *Megacricetodon minor* is the senior synonym.

(f) This procedure makes it necessary to redefine the genus *Democricetodon*. According to Fahlbusch, 1964 the type-species of *Democricetodon* is *Cricetodon minor* Lartet, 1851. However, if *C. minor* is a *Megacricetodon*-species, as proposed above, this would mean that these two genera are synonymous, and it would be necessary to introduce a new generic name. This would be unpractical, since both generic names have been generally accepted since 1964, and have been used in over a dozen publications. To avoid the introduction of a new generic name I propose to choose a new type-species for *Democricetodon.* Of course the best choice would be the species which Fahlbusch, 1964 actually meant as the type-species, and which remains without a name after *C. minor* is assigned to the small *Megacricetodon.* Schaub, 1925 described the populations from La Grive and Sansan as different subspecies, an opinion with which I fully agree. The material from Sansan should be regarded as a subspecies of *C. brevis*, and I propose to call it *Democricetodon brevis crassus* nomen novum. The holotype shall be the maxilla with M^1–M^2 which Fahlbusch, 1964 figures on page 22, fig. 7, as the lectotype of *D. minor.* Since *D. brevis crassus* and *D. minor* sensu Fahlbusch have the same type specimen there can be no doubt that *Democricetodon brevis crassus* is the same species as the one that Fahlbusch actually meant to be the type-species of *Democricetodon.* Thus, if *Democricetodon brevis crassus* is chosen as the type-species of the genus *Democricetodon*, the concept of this genus is maintained exactly in its original way.

(g) If the International Commission agrees with the above arguments, I request that it:

(1) use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type-specimen for *Cricetodon minus* Lartet, 1851, and having done so to designate the specimen described in para. (e) above as neotype of that species;

(2) use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type-species for the nominal genus *Democricetodon* Fahlbusch, 1964, made prior to the present Ruling and having done so, to designate *Democricetodon brevis crassus* nom. nov. to be the type-species of that genus;

(3) to place the generic name *Democricetodon* Fahlbusch, 1964 (gender: masculine), type-species, by designation under the plenary powers in (2) above, *Democricetodon brevis crassus*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

   (a) *minus* Lartet, 1851, as published in the binomen *Cricetodon minus*, as interpreted by the neotype designated in (1) above;

   (b) *crassus* Freudenthal, 1968, as published in the combination *Democricetodon brevis crassus* (type-species of *Democricetodon* Fahlbusch, 1964).

OPINION IN THE QUESTION " WHAT IS *CRICETODON MINOR* LARTET, 1851? "

By V. Fahlbusch

(h) The designation of a lectotype for *Cricetodon minor* Lartet, 1851 in my 1964 paper: Die Cricetiden (Mamm.) der Oberen Süsswasser-Molasse Bayerns (*Abh. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., Math.-Naturw. Kl.*, N.F. 118) was not